



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

other ordinary ecclesiastical persons, whether the earlier successors of St. Patrick, or any other of the ancient worthies of the Irish Church.

Father Colgan, on the other hand (although, perhaps, not having looked into the facts brought forward in these papers in their full connection, and in the accurate way in which we have endeavoured to present them to the reader), appears to have been sorely perplexed and distressed at the evidence furnished in the "Annals," of the fact that the old Irish clergy, including those of the highest rank and eminence among them—culdees, bishops, abbots, &c.—were commonly married men, and in so far nothing different from those reforming bishops and clergymen (Geo. Browne, of Dublin, &c.), who, in the time of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole, were branded as adulterers, and put out of their Sees, for having married wives, according to the permission of the Lord by his holy Apostles. Father Colgan, therefore, labours with much ado to confuse what is in itself so plain and intelligible; seeking, if possible, to dissipate the force of the evidence in question. In order to enable the reader to see what so learned a person, of such views, is able to make of the case, it will be best to let Colgan speak for himself; and we shall, accordingly, for this purpose, set forth here his statement of the matter, though rather a long one, in full, as follows:—

"As to what he (i.e., St. Bernard) says concerning the hereditary usurpation of that See (i.e., Armagh) for some fifteen generations, provided it be rightly understood, I regard it as being either wholly true, or very near the truth, and can show this to be the case. For by a *generation*, he doth not (as some erroneously understand it,) mean the age of one man, nor even the space of twenty years, much less a full century (seeing that Christianity itself was not so old as that in Bernard's day), but either the succession of one bishop to another of the same family (for, as I shall demonstrate presently, we find fifteen such generations or successions of bishops of one family, actually on record); or, at least, by a *generation* he understands the age at which the period of generating begins, which is, in men, that of fourteen years—as is to be inferred from his own adding immediately after, 'who had now for about 200 years kept possession of the sanctuary of God.' Therefore, by *some fifteen generations* he means only about 200 years. And that such a sort of hereditary succession did continue for so many years, or more, is to me evident from two reasons—

"First, Because the aspect of the Irish Church, which, from the year of Christ 440, to about the year 840, had been in a most flourishing condition, and, for so long, second to no other in Europe, began gradually to alter for the worse, for the course of some 200 years then following, during which, in engagements, fightings, and conflicts—not of annual, but almost monthly, and, at times, of daily occurrence—was spent the period of that unceasing warfare between the Irish and the ferocious, and then dominant, race of the Normans—i.e., the Norwegians and the Danes, and other adjacent clans—who, not content with their own vast extent of territory, conquered and subjugated England, Scotland, and the rest of the British Isles, and some of the maritime districts of Gaul, burning and destroying with pagan fury the dwellings of clergy and laity, their churches and cities, and occupying for themselves certain ports and maritime towns. These tedious disasters having reached their close, and the Normans having been beaten and slaughtered in the battle of Clontarf in the year 1013, another trouble succeeded, which was no less ruinous to the whole country and its Church's discipline and religion. The princes of the realm, engaging in quarrels relative to the chief supremacy, which occasioned constant battling from the year 1013 to 1105, and subsequently, Church discipline and religious influences received so severe a shock as well nigh annihilated them; until, at length, in that year, 1105, St. Celsus having been created Archbishop of Armagh, did his utmost for the restoring of piety from her exile, and discipline from the neglect into which she had fallen. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, if, in such disastrous times, some powerful family, especially the one which had bestowed various lands on the erection and endowment of the See of Armagh, made an effort to have prelates of their own tribe appointed to that See, and in this way to possess, as if by hereditary right, the sanctuary of God.

"The second argument which I promised above, not only establishes the credibility of that hereditary succession of prelates in the same family, but even seems to demonstrate the fact of its having really existed. For (as it appears from what has been already said in this Chronological Catalogue), from the year 925 (in which, on the death of St. Maelbride, son of Tornan, Joseph succeeded as Bishop of Armagh,) to the year 1129, (in which St. Celsus, the last of them, died,) fifteen bishops of the same family are found to have succeeded one another for the space of about 200 years, as is clearly evident from the following catalogue of them, according to the order of their succession, and the years in which, respectively, they died:—

"Maelpatrick, son of Maeltila, died the same year (925), having sat for nine months.

"Casey, son of Alcheus, died A.D. 946.

"Murray deposed, and Dudalehe, son of Kellach, substituted in his stead, an. 965.

"Murechan occupies the See, an. 993.

"Maelmury, son of Scanian, died 994.

"Maelmury, son of Hoey, 1020.
"Awley, 1049.
"Dudalehe, son of Maelmury, 1064.
"Cumuscach, 1075.
"Melisa, son of Awley, 1091.
"Donald, son of Awley, 1105.
"S. Celsus, son of Hugh, son of Melisa, died an. 1129.

"Now, from these entries we deduce that fifteen bishops of the same family did, for the space of about 200 years, retain possession, as by hereditary right, of the See of Armagh, as S. Bernard states. For from that powerful family was descended S. Celsus himself, who, happily degenerating from the unprincipled custom of his kindred, alienated the sanctuary of God from his own family to S. Malachy: for he was grandson to Melisa, Prelate of Armagh (by his son Hugh), of whom above, as is inferred from the remarks already made at A.D. 1105. It appears further, from the same entries, taken in connection with what else has been said above in this catalogue, that the statement is either true, or nearly true, which is contained in the words of S. Bernard afore-cited—viz., that there were eight before Celsus (i.e., styled Prelates of Armagh) who were married men, and without orders, but, however, men of education. For of these eight married and unordained persons were Murechan, father of Murray, Prior of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 986; Maelmury, son of Hoey, father of Dudalehe, another bishop of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 1064; Dudalehe himself, father to Hugh, Archdeacon [rather vice-archenach] of Armagh, of whom above, at A.D. 1108; Awley, father to Melisa and Donald, Prelates of Armagh, of whom [we have spoken] at A.D. 1091, 1105; Melisa, father to Flannagan, of whom at A.D. 1114; Donald, father of that pseudo-bishop [Murtoch, or] Maurice, who, supported by the secular power, thrust himself into the place of Celsus, according to what we shall state presently. The other three appear to have been, Murray, 965; Dudalehe II, son of Kellach, who was substituted in Murray's place; and Cumuscach, who died in the year 1075.

"Hence, then, arose all that relaxation of Church discipline, powerlessness of censures, and annihilation of religion, above complained of by S. Bernard. Yet were there, in the time of these pseudo-bishops, others legitimately ordained, who, acting as their suffragans, did perform episcopal offices in the diocese of Armagh—as Casey, son of Murchadhan, who died A.D. 966; Arvey, son of Cosgry, 1006; Maelmury, son of Hoey, A.D. 1020; Maeiltila, 1032; Hugh Ua Forrey, 1036; and Ken-corach, who died A.D. 1106.

"But you will say first, that some of the aforesaid persons enumerated by us among the married prelates, are described as having closed a laudable career by distinguished penitence; as Dudalehe the 2nd, who died June 2, A.D. 998; Dudalehe the 3rd, September 1, 1064, Melisa, December 20, 1091; Donald, son of Awley, who died August 2, A.D. 1105; and that they ought not, therefore, to be reckoned among the pseudo-bishops, or married men. I answer, that this inference doth not hold; for even Murtoch (who, after having seen S. Malachy elected before himself, according to the will of S. Celsus, and by the votes of the clergy and laity, still thrust himself, by the aid of the secular power, into the same See) is described afterwards as having ended his days in laudable penitence. And why should not Christian men, observing the sins and errors of their past life, have recourse to laudable penance at its close?

"You will say, secondly, that Prelate Awley administered the sacrament of Extreme Unction to Malachy, King of Ireland, when dying, in the year 1022; and that he, therefore, should not be enumerated among the married men.

"I answer, that we nowhere read of Awley's having administered the sacrament of Extreme Unction to King Malachy; but only that King Malachy was anointed in his hands. But that Awley begat two sons—viz., Melisa and Donald, who were afterwards numbered among the prelates of Armagh, is a matter evident enough from what is aforesaid. We must rather, therefore, class him with the married and unordained prelates, of whom S. Bernard speaks, than suppose him, contrary to the dignity of his position, and all right views of his order, to have begotten children by adultery and sacrilege. And seeing that, even in the present day, when ecclesiastical discipline is more strictly enforced than it has been for many ages past, we may observe in Germany, and various other countries of Europe, many persons numbered among the bishops, archbishops, and even cardinals, who have never been admitted to the sacred orders corresponding to such office, who can wonder, that in those ages of turbulence, amid so many tempests of wars, many should come to be numbered among the archbishops of the Church, who had received no sacred orders?"—Colgan's *Tria Thaumaturga: Septima Appendix ad Acta S. Patricii*, p. 301, col. 2, seq.

Such is the extraordinary account of the matter given by this most learned Roman Catholic writer. It is one, however, which will not stand examining very closely, as we shall easily prove to the reader.

(For continuation see page 149.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have again to apologize to several of our friends for postponing their valued communications. If our correspondents would recollect the limited space of our columns, when forwarding letters or articles, it would prevent much embarrassment and disappointment.

We beg to call the attention of our correspondents to the utility of adding their name and address to their communications.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, DECEMBER, 1854.

SINCE our last number appeared, an event has taken place which is full of import to the Christian world. Although we have not yet received actual intelligence of it, we may assume that on Friday, the 8th of December, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception has been decided as an article of faith in the Roman Catholic Church.

Perhaps no fact of greater importance to Christendom has taken place in our day; for it brings to a point, and it brings under our own view, the great question which so long has distrusted the Christian world.

The great question has been, whether the Church of Rome has preserved unchanged the faith which Christ and his Apostles delivered to the world.

If the Church of Rome has preserved that faith unchanged, then all who differ from her must be wrong; but if the Church of Rome has changed that faith, then to "contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" is the duty of all who will follow the blessed Apostles as they followed Christ.

This great question has been argued in reference to many particulars, in respect of which it is said that the Church of Rome has formerly altered her faith; but these alterations are said to have taken place many centuries ago; and it is, perhaps, not easy for plain people to judge about past events with the same certainty with which they judge of the events which happen in their own day, and within their own knowledge. But now the question, whether the Church of Rome has preserved the Apostles' faith unchanged since the Apostles' days, must be argued upon a fact which is actually taking place while we write these pages.

The Council of Trent professed to deliver nothing concerning matters of faith but what had been handed down unchanged from the time of the Apostles. Speaking of the purity of the Gospel, that Council says, "seeing that this truth is contained in written books and unwritten traditions, which, being received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or delivered by the Apostles as with their own hands, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down even to us. . . . Moreover, those traditions, whether pertaining to faith or morals, it (the Council) receives with equal affection of piety and reverence, and venerates, as being dictated by word of mouth, either by Christ or the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession."*

And when they come to declare their doctrine

* Perspiciens hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, que ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis accepte, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus tradite, ad nos usque pervenerunt. . . . Necnon traditiones ipsas, cum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."—*Sess. quarta.*

on particular points, they profess to do it on the principles above laid down. Thus, they teach their doctrine of justification as being that "which Jesus Christ, the Son of Righteousness, the author and *finisher* of our faith, taught, which the Apostles delivered, and the Catholic Church, at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, always retained."* And so in all their doctrines they profess to teach nothing else but what Christ himself taught, the Apostles delivered, and the Church always held.

It is true that Protestants deny that *all* their doctrines were so delivered. For instance, they say it is hard to see how the words "I absolve thee," could have been instituted by Christ himself as the form of a sacrament, when no trace is found of those words in the Church for a thousand years, as shown in another column of our paper. But still this fact remains, that the Council of Trent *professed* to teach nothing but what had been taught and delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and always held in the Church. This is a great fact, which should be carefully attended to now. This principle of taking the whole faith from the actual teaching of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, handed down either by writing or by tradition, has the supposed infallible sanction of a Pope and a general council.

But now this principle itself is about to be given up.

It is not merely that a new article is to be added to the faith of the Church of Rome, but the principle itself is to be abandoned, that Christ is the author and the *FINISHER* of the faith; that everything ought to be drawn from what He taught and the Apostles delivered. We shall call attention to both these points as we proceed.

That the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, although believed as an *opinion* by many Roman Catholics, has never yet been held as a *matter of faith* by the Church of Rome, is very easily proved; for it is, in fact, confessed.

St. Bernard, in the 12th century, declared that the doctrine was then newly invented, without any tradition to support it, but founded on a false revelation.

In the year 1483, Pope Sixtus IV. forbade any one to call those heretics who *denied* the Immaculate Conception; and for this reason—"Because it has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See."

The Dominicans, one of the orders of the Church of Rome, *always* denied this doctrine.

The Council of Trent expressly declared that they did *not* decide on this doctrine; and they expressly renewed the above decree of Pope Sixtus IV.

The Roman Catholic Bishop Milner, in England, declared, not forty years ago, "The Church does *not* decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin."[†]

And the present Pope declared, about five years ago, "This honour *has not yet* been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See."

We have given these authorities fully in vol. 1, p. 20, and again in vol. 3, pp. 96, 97, and none of our correspondents has ever ventured to deny or question any of them.

Thus, we may fairly take it as confessed, that this doctrine is new; never before established by the Church of Rome.

It is true that many Roman Catholics have believed in the Immaculate Conception; but, then, they held it as an opinion of their own, not as the doctrine of their Church. They were equally at liberty to deny it, if they thought fit. So Doctor

Milner says expressly, "The Church leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it." This makes the difference between the opinions of individuals, and the doctrine of a Church.

But *now*, this doctrine is to be made an *article of faith* in the Church of Rome.

As the doctrines authorized by Rome stood a week ago, a man who denied this doctrine, and denounced it as false and unholy, as St. Bernard did, might die and go to heaven, where, we hope, St. Bernard is; but if that man does not now immediately change his opinion, he must certainly be damned, for denying an article of the Roman faith.

So the Roman faith is changing, or has changed, within the last week, under our very eyes.

But it is not merely the change in the faith of the Church of Rome, that makes this decision so important. It has changed THE PRINCIPLE which lies at the root of all faith.

Hitherto, as we have seen from the Council of Trent, the Church of Rome professed to hold no doctrine but what Christ taught to his Apostles, and the Apostles delivered to the Church. Pope Pius IX. and his assembled bishops, by adopting as an article of Catholic faith what is confessed not to have been taught by Christ, or delivered by his Apostles, have now virtually renounced this principle.

We say this is confessed. It is explicitly confessed by Bishop Milner, when he says "the Church *sees nothing* absolutely clear and certain concerning it, *either in the written or unwritten word*, and, therefore, leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it."

It was confessed by Pope Sixtus IV., when he said, "it has not yet been decided by the Roman Church and the Apostolic See." It was virtually confessed by the present Pope, when he said, "this honour has not yet been decreed to the Most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See."

If the Church of Rome *now* believes that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception *was* taught by Christ, and delivered by the Apostles to the Church, how can she defend HERSELF for allowing her members full liberty to disbelieve it for 1850 years?

It must, therefore, be confessed that this doctrine was not taught by Christ, nor delivered by his Apostles.

Whoever now adopts this doctrine as an article of the faith, does thereby abandon and reject the principle that faith must be limited to the teaching of Christ.

We know that some have done so already. Dr. Newman, the much-boasted convert, has actually published a book, in which he openly avows that some of the present doctrines of the Church of Rome were not taught by Christ and his Apostles, and cannot be proved either by Scripture or tradition; and that no such proof is required for doctrines sanctioned by infallible authority.

Until now this principle has not been adopted by the Church of Rome; but now, as we have shown, this principle is both adopted and acted on by the Pope and his assembled bishops.

This is the most fearful step ever yet taken by the Church of Rome.

It is one which calls on every member, and every priest, of that Church, to consider his position.

We know that there are many priests who were shocked at Mr. Newman's startling doctrine, and at the reception which he, and his doctrines, met with in high quarters.

An able Roman Catholic Review in America (Brownson's) exposed and condemned that book, and had great support in doing so.

What are those priests to do now, when the

principle of that book is adopted and acted on in matters of faith?

We trust that there are many priests who have hitherto sincerely believed that they were teaching nothing but what Christ taught, and his Apostles delivered. What are those priests to do now, when they see a new article of faith concocted before their eyes, which it is impossible to believe was taught by Christ and his Apostles?

If they will have a good conscience towards God, they must adhere to what they believe that Christ and his Apostles taught.

Solemnly, earnestly, affectionately, we call on the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland to consider this question.

Did Christ teach the Immaculate Conception to the Apostles?

Did the Apostles deliver it to the Churches?

Can it be shown that this doctrine was ever heard of in the Church for a thousand years?

If Christ taught, and the Apostles delivered it, how came it to be so long unknown? How came it that it was never yet established in the Church of Rome?

If not so taught, can any one *now* make it a part of "the faith once delivered to the saints?"

If these questions need a discussion, our pages are open for it; if this doctrine can be shown to come from the teaching of Christ, then, in the name of God, let all our readers be convinced of it; but if this cannot even be attempted, then, in the name of God, let the priests look every man to his own soul, and stand up for "the faith once delivered to the saints," without addition or subtraction.

We have ever desired to deal with candour and kindness towards the Roman Catholic priests. Where we have had to censure, we have confined it to those whose acts deserved it. Where we have seen conduct deserving of respect, we have accorded it freely. We have now no object in view but to awaken them to the solemn importance of their position at this time.

There are among them men of ability and learning, we trust, men of sincerity, too, who have not disgraced their position by exciting the passions, or imposing on the ignorance of the people. We call on these men to consider the principle of the Council of Trent—that nothing can be of faith but what Christ taught, and his Apostles delivered. We call on them to consider the vast importance and the deep responsibility of their own position, now that they are driven by their Church, either to abandon or to stand up for that principle.

No greater or more solemn question has ever been forced on the consideration of priests; and those whose hearts may be stirred to meet it with a zeal for God, and for the faith which Christ delivered, will earn for themselves no ordinary position in the Church of God.

Have the priests of Ireland *always* hitherto maintained that the Church *can teach*, and *has taught*, nothing but what Christ taught, and the Apostles delivered? and are there no champions among them now to take their stand upon this sure foundation, ere it pass from under their feet for ever?

Let them awake, and arise. The trial may be great and the struggle fierce, both without and within; but no more certain call to everlasting victory was ever proclaimed in the Church of God.

Let them come forth, and fight the good fight of faith in this; and let them trust that God will make their way plain in other things.

Nor is there wanting much prospect of encouragement and support.

The doctrines advocated in this paper, and the means by which those doctrines are advocated, may well lead priests to hope that they have

* "Quam Sol justitiae Christus Jesus, fidei nostrae auctor et consummator, docuit, Apostoli tradiderunt, et Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto suggeste, perpetuo retinuit."—Praem. Ses. sexta.

+ Milner's *End of Controversy*, part i., letter 12. All the quotations from Bishop Milner, in this article, are taken from the same place.

something sounder and more ancient to look to, than what they have been accustomed to suppose that Protestantism is; and though all means, both human and ecclesiastical, would, no doubt, be resorted to against such a priest, yet, surely, the priests must be well aware that any man of character and ability who should now take this course, would probably find his people nearly as ready for it as himself, and both able and willing to support him.

Are there no mighty men in Israel, to stand forth before the world and the Church!

We beg to state that, with a view to facilitate fair discussion, we shall be happy to forward the **CATHOLIC LAYMAN** henceforward, *without charge*, to any Roman Catholic clergyman who will be good enough to intimate either to the editor or publisher, 9, Upper Sackville-street, his desire to receive it in future, direct through the post. We also beg to express a hope that our regular subscribers will be good enough to forward their subscriptions for the ensuing year (together with any arrears due) on or before the 1st of January next. We need scarcely remind them, though 3s. 6d. is a small sum, that when a large number of such sums is in arrear, it imposes a serious difficulty in the way of the conductors. The sums paid for stamp duty during the past year alone, amounts to nearly £400.

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY.

(Continued from page 147.)

1. Colgan represents the system of hereditary succession as *an abuse which crept into* some Churches in Ireland, (at least into Armagh); and this long after the first planting of Christianity in the country; that it commenced, in fact, subsequently to the year 840, and after the face of religion in the country had been miserably darkened by Danish barbarism. Whereas we have seen that it was a prevalent custom among the Irish Christians, elsewhere, as well as in Armagh, from a much earlier age; as illustrated in several examples given in the last paper, and as having, according to ancient Irish tradition (as we saw at the outset, and subsequently,) the sanction of St. Patrick himself, and of the other eminent luminaries of early Christianity in this island.

2. Colgan pretends that King Malachy the great was not anointed in his dying hour by "Awley, successor of Patrick" (as the Irish Annals call him), but by some deputy bishop or priest whose name is not given, nor his presence in any way alluded to in the "Annals." And when the "Annals" say, (as already quoted, in No. III.) that he was anointed in [or, at] the hands of Awley, Colgan would seem to have us understand, that Awley only held him, for some other person to anoint; but Dr. O'Donovan, whose object was only to translate the passage correctly, without having any crooked argumentative purpose to serve, renders it thus—"after being anointed by the hands" of Awley; the original *Annalist's* intention having been, obviously, to tell who actually performed the rite, and to mention by name such of the more dignified *clergy* as were present at King Malachy's death-bed, and saying masses, with psalms and hymns, for his repose in that hour.

3. Colgan's mode of representing the testimony of the Irish Annalists concerning the family so long possessed of the See of Armagh is most unreasonable. Those Annalists, in recording the events which appeared worthy of note in the history of their native Church, were utterly unconscious, as far as we can see, of any wrong done to that Church by the family in question. The custom complained of was certainly liable to abuses; but it was not, after all, attended with worse evils, nor was it any worse founded in right, equity, or Holy Scripture, than the system which succeeded it, of papal and regal squabbling, against local influences not less worthy of support, for the control of episcopal appointments. The Irish Annalists nowhere say a word against the family which opposed St. Malachy; though Bernard, in the spirit of a partisan of the Church of Rome (whose influence and authority were concerned in the struggle), was led to use such very strong language on the subject. Colgan, looking into the "Annals" for some expression to harmonize with those ideas of Bernard's, could find none more to his purpose than the statement, that some of those whom he calls pseudo-bishops (*i.e.*, nominal bishops, no real bishops), *died penitent*; and he seems to think this penitence may refer to their usurpation of the primacy. But that expression is used of men of piety and worth, according to the opinion of the Annalists, and does not by any means imply conversion from a life of grievous impiety, in its ordinary use. Thus, Malachy the great, above named,

who, whatever his sins, was no usurper, is said by them to have died after "intense penance." (A.D. 1022.) And so at A.D. 1147, we find "Murray O'Flanagan, a choice priest, died after intense penance"; and at 1149, "Bishop O'Gormly, a noble, devout senior, died, after suffering [*or* 'penance,' according to O'Donovan], and after intense penitence." But on a point so absurdly plain to any fair and unprejudiced mind, it were foolish to multiply illustrations.

4. As the old Irish Annalists, whose records are embodied in the compilation of the Four Masters, nowhere allude to, or seem conscious of, any ecclesiastical defect connected with the married prelates of Armagh, which could interfere with their ministrations about holy things, but rather represent them as saying masses, anointing men for death, &c., as clerical persons; so neither have they the slightest allusion to any of those suffragans, or deputies, with which some learned men, in late ages, have kindly supplied them. We meet, indeed, in the "Annals" with instances of *vice-abbots* and *vice-erenachs*; but those *vice-primates*, *vice-bishops* of *Armagh*, or *deputy successors of Patrick*, of whom Colgan speaks, are persons altogether unnoticed by them in that capacity. Colgan is, indeed, lamentably inaccurate on this point. For, whereas he includes Primate Awley among the undominated married men, who required of necessity to have deputies to perform their duties; and Maelmury, son of Hoey, among the deputies, or suffragans, who performed such clerical functions in their stead; the *Annalists*, on the contrary, testify that Awley held the very office which this Maelmury had previously held, and actually succeeded him in it.—See the extract at A.D. 1020, in our last paper. But Colgan seems to have confusedly interchanged in the above place the name of this Maelmury, son of Hoey, who was actually primate, with that of Maelmury, son of Scanlan, who was only Bishop of Armagh, (see at A.D. 994, No. III.), though he had a little previously enumerated both among the fifteen usurping primates.

The truth of the matter would seem to be simply this, that in the ages preceding the time of Kellach and Malachy, the offices of *Primate*, or *Successor of St. Patrick*, and of *Bishop of Armagh*, were, generally speaking, altogether distinct; differing much in their natures, as well as held by distinct individuals, although they might occasionally be found united in one person. And it was only in the time, and also in the person, of St. Malachy, that an attempt was first made to unite and consolidate the two offices permanently, with a view to assimilate the Church discipline of Ireland to that of other branches of the Church, and securing for the *Archbishop of Armagh*, as such, whatever of dignity, prestige, wealth, or influence, had previously been enjoyed by the *Successors of St. Patrick*, as such—in other words, by the *abbots of Armagh*. These remarks will, perhaps, be more fully understood from an inspection of all the obits of such persons (*i.e.*, either abbots or bishops of Armagh), which occur in the "Annals" during the sixth and seventh centuries, which are as follows:—

- A.D. 512, Duagh, of Drum-Deary, *Bishop of Armagh*, breathed forth his spirit.
- A.D. 525, Ailill, *Bishop of Armagh*, who was of the Hy-Breasail [race], died.
- A.D. 535, Oiliill, *Bishop of Armagh*, also of the Hy-Breasail [race], died.
- A.D. 550, David —, *Bishop of Armagh* —, died.
- A.D. 577, Felimy Finn, *Abbot of Armagh*, died.
- A.D. 587, S. Caorlan, *Bishop of Armagh*, died.
- A.D. 597, Hoey, son of Dermot, *Bishop and Abbot of Armagh*, died.
- A.D. 609, Seanach, *Abbot of Armagh* (from Cluny-greek), died.
- A.D. 622, Mac Laisre, *Bishop and Abbot of Armagh*, died.

A.D. 660, S. Tomian, son of Ronan, *Bishop of Armagh*, died.

A.D. 686, S. Segenius, of Aghaclave, *Bishop of Armagh*, died.

Some learned writers have supposed that the Annalists had a confused way of writing "*Bishop of Armagh*," or "*Abbot of Armagh*," where, if they had learned to express themselves accurately, they should have said, "*Archbishop of Armagh*," adding, perhaps, "*Primate of all Ireland*," or other like titles of dignity, accommodated to more modern ears. But the student, who carefully examines the original "Annals," will see little in them to countenance any such notion; and will rather conclude that when a "*Bishop of Armagh*" is named, it means simply the person exercising episcopal functions in the establishment at Armagh, the function of ordination especially; and, in like manner, that the "*successor of Patrick*," or "*Abbot of Armagh*," implies simply the ruler of the religious establishment there, its head, to whose authority even the bishop, when a distinct person, was subject; although the abbot was, at times, as is evident from the above entries, bishop also. When he was not, he still, no doubt, ruled, but left ordination to the bishop. As for what St. Bernard says of Primate Awley and the other seven, whom he calls *undominated* persons, the statement must be received with some hesitation and qualification, considering the quarter whence it comes; and it can, in all probability, signify no more, at the utmost, than that the parties concerned were not *elected and ordained with canonical regularity*, according to the

usages of the Church of Rome—any ordination independent of which Befnard would probably ignore.

5. But that those married prelates of Armagh were possessed of such orders as were considered, by the Irish people, sufficient to constitute them clergymen at least, if not even bishops, is most certain; not only from the general way of mentioning them in the "Annals," where their occupying of the primacy, collecting of visitation rents, &c., are mentioned, without the least hint of there being anything sacrilegious in such appropriation of ecclesiastical property, but also from other circumstances which we may there find noticed concerning them; as, for instance, Awley's having anointed King Malachy, which Colgan so lamely endeavours to disprove. And, again, Murechan, whom he sets down as the first of those eight married and undominated persons, is introduced at A.D. 992, of the "Annals" as inaugurating, or consecrating to his kingly office, Hugh, son of Donnell, Lord of Oileach-i.e., the prince of one of the most famous provincial royalties in Ireland. This act it were very absurd to suppose performed by a mere undominated layman, who was, in that character, at most, but an inferior prince to the one who received his blessing. Maelmury, son of Hoey, another of these married prelates, is called by the Annalists (A.D. 1020), "the head of the clergy of all the north-west of Europe, and flood of dignity of the western world;" whereas, according to Colgan, he must either have been no clergyman at all, and, in that case, guilty of sacrilege, or else, if a clergyman, then both sacrilegious and adulterous, in his marrying and begetting children in holy orders. Awley, the next of those prelates (*ib.*), was appointed by the suffrages of the laity and clergy, and acknowledged as primate through all Ireland, even in the most southern parts, being received and honoured with visitation dues, &c., in Munster (A.D. 1021); which was not very likely to have happened if he was a mere layman in the estimation of the Irish people. Again, Dudalehe, son of Kellach, whom Colgan mentions in the last place but one, as likely to have been one of the married and undominated men, was so highly esteemed as primate, both in Ireland and beyond its limits, that a vacancy occurring in the office of Successor of Columkille (or chief ruler of his monasteries in Iona, Derry, and elsewhere generally), he was, by the common choice of the Irish and Scots, elected to fill the situation; so that, if Dudalehe was undominated, then, contrary to all that has ever been suggested on the subject, not only the electors to the See of Armagh, but also the religious congregations following the rule of Columkille in Scotland and Ireland, must voluntarily have selected a mere layman for their head; which it is not very likely that any person acquainted with the history of those times will regard as a probable hypothesis.

The short and the long of it is, that Father Colgan has made a very sad mess of this whole matter; nor could he, approaching it with his invincible prepossessions and prejudices, have done any better. Nor will any person do better at it, who approaches a subject of the kind with a determination to squeeze it into some particular shape, suitable to his own preconceived notions, though sanctioned by the traditions of centuries; and who is not rather prepared to listen to what an original authority says for itself, and receive, as its testimony, whatever it seems naturally intended to convey to the reader. It was a neglect of this that led Colgan to that sensible remark, that St. Bernard is *more severe* on Primate Niall, and others of our old clergy, who married wives, and begat sons and daughters, than are our native "Annals." The degree in which the two sorts of authorities differ, is certainly worthy of our attention. According to the one, those married ecclesiastics were guilty of sacrifice and adultery, perpetrators of deeds of damnation, and cunning enough to add to their crimes even after death; tyrants, not clergymen; profaners of the sanctuary of God. So speak St. Bernard and Colgan, and other upholders of the supremacy of Rome. According to the other view, Conn-na-mbocht, Head of the Culdees of Clonmacnoise, and an anchorite, although himself a married man, and the descendant, in direct lineal succession, through ten generations, of abbots and bishops, erenachs and anchorites (covering a space of three hundred years), was, after all, "the glory and dignity" of the religious establishment in which he flourished. So speak our native "Annals."

If any member of the Church of Rome, in this country, be disposed for a moment to think that, perhaps, the Irish Church was actually in so bad a state as to deserve the severe censures of St. Bernard, that, in fact, so eminent a person would not have given utterance to them without cause, it may suffice to remind him, that such was not, certainly, the general opinion of Christendom concerning the Irish Church, in those early ages preceding the coming of the English, throughout which, we have shown this system of marrying, among the abbots, bishops, and other clerical persons in Ireland, and hereditary succession to ecclesiastical offices and benefices, to have prevailed; the Irish Church having been famous, throughout Europe, for its men of eminence, for learning and piety, schools and missions, in the same ages. And, even in the later age, when St. Bernard flourished, she little needed, according to the opinion of Dr. Lanigan and other authors of like sentiments, any foreign interference to revive her discipline or piety; her own sons having not only sufficient informa-